REMARK

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 over Sweitzer and Feuser

In the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,570,915 to Sweitzer et al. ("Sweitzer") in light of Feuser *et al.* ("On the Effects of IEEE 802.3x Flow Control in Full-Duplex Ethernet LANs, 1999)("Feuser"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 recite a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node.

The Examiner acknowledges in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action Applicants' argument that Feuser fails to disclose or suggest issuing a network lock command to prevent interference from other nodes during an adjustment of a network node. (see Office Action, page 2) The Examiner argues that "Feuser discloses issuing network pause (lock) commands, that cease particular nodes from communicating on the network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that these commands could be used to stop nodes from communicating for any reason, and would have advantageously allowed a user of Sweitzer's calibration system to stop other nodes from transmitting during the calibration procedure, eliminating any undesired effect unwanted transmissions would have on the calibration results." (see Office Action, page 2).

The Examiner's statements are <u>unsupported</u>. The Examiner's acknowledges that Feuser teaches a network pause frame. However, a thorough reading of Feuser teaches that such a network pause command is used

for <u>flow control</u> within a network element, i.e., a "congested switch has time to pass on the waiting packets to their destinations, leading to a decrease in the buffer occupancy." (see Section 1). Thus, Feuser <u>only</u> teaching a network pause frame for "a decrease in the buffer occupancy" fails to disclose, teach or suggest <u>anything</u> related to **calibration** of a node, much less a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node, as recited by claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24.

Moreover, the Examiner broad statement "that these commands could be used to stop nodes from communicating <u>for any reason</u>" is <u>unsupported</u> by the cited reference. As discussed above, the Examiner's cited reference only supports the use of a pause frame for <u>flow control</u>. The Examiner's broad statement allegedly makes <u>every use</u>, i.e., "<u>for any reason</u>", of Feuser's pause frame an obvious use of such a frame. Feuser fails to support such an allegation. If the Examiner continues to allege that Feuser supports use of a pause frame "<u>for any reason</u>", the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide support in the cited reference for such an allegation.

Sweitzer and Feuser, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node, as recited by claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 over Shober, Ang and Feuser

In the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schober in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,630 to Ang ("Ang") and further in view of Feuser. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 recite a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node.

The Examiner acknowledges that Shober and Ang fail "to specifically recite issuing from the first or second nodes a network lock command during the adjustment of the second node transceiver, ceasing nodes other than said first node or said second node from communicating on the network." (see Office Action, page 6). The Examiner relies on Feuser to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Shober and Ang to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Feuser <u>at best</u> teaches a network pause command that is used for <u>flow control</u> within a network element, i.e., a "congested switch has time to pass on the waiting packets to their destinations, leading to a decrease in the buffer occupancy." (see Section 1). Thus, Feuser teaching a network pause frame for "a decrease in the buffer occupancy" fails to disclose, teach or suggest <u>anything</u> related to **calibration** of a node, much less a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node, as recited by claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24.

Sweitzer, Ang and Feuser, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a network lock command that prevents other nodes on a network other than a first node and a second node from affecting a **calibration** result experienced by the second node, as recited by claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df